

King's Cross Development Forum

Annual Review Meeting 6:30 p.m. 22 November 2016

Committee Room 1, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, London WC1H 9JE

1 Attendance

1.1 Present

Raphael Andrews, Andrew Bosi, John Chamberlain, Andrew Clayton, Rachel Coyle, Helia Evans, Nicholas Falk, Ben Fernandez, Jim Humphris, Ivor Kamlish, Deklan Kilfeather, Jasmine King, Hugh Lake, Robert Milne, Vijya Patel, Diana Shelley, Norman Sheppard, Lisa Tang, Paul Tomlinson, Malcolm Tucker, Herman Tribelnig and Ben Williams

1.2 Apologies

Zannthie Bennett, Rachel Coyle, Jean James, Philip James, John Mason, Roger Robinson, Lucy Tamman and Daniel Zylbersztajn

2 Previous meeting

2.1 Notes

The notes for the meeting of 5 July 2016 had been circulated and posted on the website and were formally approved.

2.2 Matters arising

Nothing was discussed.

3 Developments

5.1 Transport

Lisa Young, from Transport for London, outlined the conclusions from the initial consultation on the King's Cross gyratory. She was accompanied by Acacia Hasler and Laura Brett, who is the transport planner in Camden working with Transport for London on King's Cross; unfortunately Laura Brett (the counterpart of Acacia Hasler in Islington) was unable to attend owing to illness. She paid particular attention to the respects in which the follow-up work was in line with the response of the Forum to the consultation (and, presumably, many others of the 1,042 responses to the consultation). In particular, Transport for London was looking at:

- The shape and size of the congestion charge zone and ultra-low emission zone.
- The enforcement of existing rules, such as those on engine idling.
- The possibility of having raised tables for pedestrian and cyclist crossings.
- The value of two way working on each of the roads.

The feasibility design, with traffic modelling (of, for example, the effect of two way working on Pancras Road) was now intended to extend as far as Euston Station and to take into account other schemes, such as the cycling routes and the north-south traffic flows. The consultation about it had

been intended for the middle of 2017 (June, say) but might now be pushed out until September because it might not receive adequate responses in the summer.

Various members of the Forum were dissatisfied with this possibility of postponing the consultation; they would have liked to see it in March, not June, let alone September. Nicholas Falk pointed out that suggestions for improving the experience of crossing the Euston Road (such as putting escalators in the underpass) had been put forward several years ago; they had still not be implemented, though they could be implemented at relatively low cost and without foreclosing options for the longer term plans. The works on the roads under these plans would not be before 2019-2020, as they are to be co-ordinated with the works for High Speed 2. Pedestrian routes, both north-south and east-west, deserved particular attention before then. In response it was remarked that timer display pedestrian traffic lights were to be installed shortly.

In a similar vein, Hugh Lake pointed out that the Forum had some years ago proposed that vehicles be permitted to turn north on Midland Way (so that wasteful trips around the stations could be avoided) but that Camden had not reacted in any way.

The traffic modelling currently planned would include the cyclists but not the pedestrians except for the journeys between the stations. However, the business case was supposed to take into account pedestrian movements. The Forum questioned how the business case (using costs of journey durations) could be correct if the traffic modelling excluded pedestrian movements.

Shortening intermodal transport interchange distances and shortening transport waiting times were mentioned as ways of reducing congestion. In this context bus stop location and bus throughput were important and perhaps fairly easy to change.

Herman Tribelnig pointed out that the details of urban design were very important and should not be ignored or left until late in the day. Previous joint work by Transport for London and Camden, in Mornington Crescent, demonstrated the failure of urban engineering to take account of this.

Notably missing from the presentation was any mention of the alternative proposals for the King's Cross gyratory from the London Cycling Campaign (though these are described in an annex to the report on the initial consultation).

A more general discussion of transport matters ensued. Forum members would like to consider:

- The intention of allowing vehicles on King's Boulevard (which was envisaged in the outline plan, but which should be re-examined in the light of the thinking about the gyratory and the growth in pedestrian use).
- The bus routes in and around the King's Cross Central area (which might include, for example, a small site bus to ferry residents and employees to major transport hubs).
- The consultancy study of Maiden Lane Station (which should be carried out under the Section 106 agreement when some development thresholds are crossed).

4 Annual review

4.1 Report

Ben Williams drew attention to the annual review report and thanked everyone for their contributions over the past year. This had been a rather quiet year, partly because few development plans had come

forward and partly because various speakers had withdrawn from proposed meetings. The intention to engage fully with other occupants of King's Cross Central (or indeed with organisations such as the King's Cross Knowledge Quarter) had still not be put into effect adequately.

Norman Sheppard drew attention to Design Junction 2016 as a forerunner of possible future events. He suggested that there should be an Open City event to let people see inside the new buildings and experience, with guides, the public spaces; it should cover not just King's Cross Central but also Regent's Quarter, King's Place, Maiden Lane, Camley Street, Saint Pancras Way, the Francis Crick Institute, the British Library and the Institute of Physics.

4.2 Matters arising

Nothing was discussed.

4 Design and Access Forum

Nothing was reported.

5 Design and Access Forum

Nothing was reported.

6 Operations

6.1 Community Infrastructure Levy

The CIL levied by the Mayor of London is spent on CrossRail. However, 25% of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) levied by Camden Council will be devoted to local works. The Forum had notified councillors that it would like to be consulted on priorities. It had in fact been asked for its opinion on one occasion, with less than a day's notice.

6.2 Links with other groups

Robert Milne noted that to engage most usefully with all the occupants of King's Cross Central the Forum needed a Secretary that (by contrast with him) lived or worked there; for instance, such a Secretary might develop a newsletter, which (by analogy with his own immediate locality) might be more effective for communication than a web site. Hugh Lake urged the Forum to find a replacement, as had been envisaged for some years.

6.3 The allocation of Section 106 money

Nothing was reported outside the annual review report.

6.4 Use of funds

Jim Humphris noted that following the handover from Matty Mitford to himself as Treasurer he was unable to access the account until he obtained authorisation from an earlier signatory (Geoffrey Roper or Michael Edwards). He intended to seek that authorisation but to cease being Treasurer then. The Forum duly passed a resolution that the funds should be transferred to an account with three signatories.

6.5 Elections of the Chair, Joint Deputy Chairs, Secretary, Treasurer and other Steering Group members

The following were elected without objection:

- Chair: Deklan Kilfeather
- Deputy Chairs: Ben Williams
- Secretary: Robert Milne
- Treasurer: Jim Humphris
- Other Steering Group members: Helia Evans, Jasmine King, Norman Sheppard and Malcolm Tucker

7 Future meetings

7.1 Date and place

The Plimsoll Building Community Centre was suggested as a venue, whenever the management for it is arranged.

7.2 Agenda

Among future topics might be transport in and around King's Cross Central, the open space policy, plans for local events, and the developments at the Regent's Wharf in All Saints Road and at the Royal Mail Sorting Office in Saint Pancras Way.

8 Any other business

8.1 Fish Bridge

The Fish Bridge (between Goods Way and Granary Square) was described briefly. The Forum agreed to question what it was for and whether the money for it could be spent more usefully in other ways.

9 Actions

The Steering Group to develop intentions of the Forum for the coming year.

The Steering Group to find replacements for the current Secretary and Treasurer.

The Steering Group to query the purpose and value of the Fish Bridge.

The Steering Group to press for the revival of the Construction Impact Group.